



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,995	12/14/2001	Stefan Alfons Hepper	DE920000081US1	4982
7590	06/03/2004		EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION			QURESHI, SHABANA	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT.				
P.O. BOX 218			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598			2155	6
DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

P24

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/016,995	HEPPER ET AL
	Examiner Shabana Qureshi	Art Unit 2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

Corrections to drawings are appropriate for examination purposes; however, formal drawings must be submitted prior to allowance of application.

Response to Arguments

Claims 1-17 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant argues that :

- Oliver does not teach “at least one content provider offering a new content to the portal” and
- Oliver does not teach the portal accepting or rejecting at least a particular provider included in the at least one content provider based on stored credentials.

Regarding Applicant’s first argument, Examiner directs Applicant to paragraph 0133, where Oliver teaches the content provider adding new content to the portal by updating all new transactional records in the database. As it is the duty of the Examiner to interpret claims as broadly as possible, Examiner interprets paragraph 0133 to read on the claim limitation of the Applicant.

As per Applicant’s second argument, Examiner directs Applicant to further read paragraph 0037, where authentication of service providers are based on transactional records. As it is the duty of the Examiner to interpret claims as broadly as possible, Examiner interprets paragraph 0133 to read on the claim limitation of the Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oliver et al (US 2002/0133412 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Oliver et al teach a method for operating a computer system comprising:

- having at least one content provider coupled via a portal which may also be coupled to a user [abstract; 0118];
- the at least one content provider offering a new content to the portal [abstract; 0110];
- the portal comparing credentials of the at least one content provider with stored credentials of registered content providers [0118; 0133]; and
- the portal accepting or rejecting at least a particular provider included in the at least one content provider based on the stored credentials [0133; 0031; 0120].

As per claim 2, Oliver et al teach a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising offering the credentials of the at least one content provider to the portal together with the new content [0133].

As per claim 3, Oliver et al teach a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising storing the credentials of the registered content providers in a database of the portal [0133; 0155].

As per claim 4, Oliver et al teach a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising performing automatically the comparison of the credentials with an intelligent program having a rule database [0161-0236].

As per claim 5, Oliver et al teach a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising performing manually the comparison of the credentials [0133].

As per claim 2, Oliver et al teach a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the portal checking the new content, and the portal accepting or rejecting the new content [0133; 0031; 0120].

As per claim 7, Oliver et al teach a method as recited in claim 6 wherein the evaluation of the new content is performed semi-automatically or fully automatically [0162].

As per claim 8, Oliver et al teach a method as recited in claim 6 wherein the user is notified about the new content if the new content matches with preferences of the user [0122].

As per claim 9, Oliver et al teach an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing operation of a computer system, the computer readable program code means in the article of manufacture comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the steps of claim 1 [0161-0236].

As per claim 10, Oliver et al teach a computer system comprising at least one content provider which is coupled to a portal which may be coupled to a user [0296] wherein the at least one content provider comprises means for offering a new content to the portal [0296], wherein the portal comprises means for comparing credentials of the at least one content provider with stored credentials of registered content providers [0133], and wherein the portal comprises means for accepting or rejecting the at least one content provider [0133; 0031; 0120].

As per claim 11, Oliver et al teach the computer system of claim 10 wherein the portal comprises a database for registered content provider credentials [0133].

As per claim 12, Oliver et al teach a computer system as recited in claim 10 wherein the at least one content providers, the portal and the user are coupled via the Internet [0028, 0113].

As per claim 13, Oliver et al teach a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform method steps for causing operation of a computer system, the method steps comprising the steps of claim 1 [0161-0236].

As per claim 14, Oliver et al teach an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing operation of a computer system, the computer readable program code means in the article of manufacture comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the steps of claim 2 [0161-0236].

As per claim 15, Oliver et al teach an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing operation of a computer system, the computer readable program code means in the article of manufacture comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the steps of claim 1 [0161-0236].

As per claim 16, Oliver et al teach a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing operation of a computer system, the computer readable program code means in the computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 11 [0161-0236].

As per claim 17, Oliver et al teach the computer system of claim 10 further comprising checking means for the portal to check the new content, and the portal accepting or rejecting the new content based on a determination of the checking means [0037, 0074, .0133, 0120].

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shabana Qureshi whose telephone number is (703) 308-6118. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Shabana Qureshi
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

SQ
01 June2004

mtc
HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER